



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/316,754	05/21/1999	SHIA-SAN GONG	AT9-98-884	8260

7590 05/22/2003

BARRY NEWBERGER  
WINSTEAD, SECHREST & MINICK  
100 CONGRESS AVENUE  
SUITE 800  
AUSTIN, TX 78701

EXAMINER

VO, LILIAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2127

DATE MAILED: 05/22/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/316,754

Applicant(s)

GONG ET AL.

Examiner

Lilian Vo

Art Unit

2127

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 May 1999.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 21 May 1999 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### DETAILED ACTION

1. Claim 9 – 22 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim.

Election was made **without** traverse in Paper No. 5.

2. Claims 1 – 8 are presented for the examination.

### *Response to Arguments*

3. Applicants' arguments with respect to claims 1 – 8 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### *Drawings*

4. The drawings are objected to because figs 5 – 8 are not clear.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.



The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

6. Claims 1 – 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Srinivasan et al (US Pat. Application 2001/0051948 A1).

Regarding **claim 1**, Srinivasan et al. disclose a method for storing data that has at least some entries with multiple value attributes (figs. 2A – 2C and 4 – 6), comprising the steps of:

profiling the data to determine whether the data should be stored in an attribute table (fig. 4 shows data stored in an attribute table. Note that the attribute table of fig. 4 shows that the types, i.e. 'EID', 'AttrName', 'AttrVal', and 'AttrKind' are sorted categories. This inherently indicated that the data must have been profiled before the table could be created) or, alternatively, in a merged table and an overflow table (fig. 5 and paragraphs 0046 – 0047); and storing the data optimally based in the profiling step (paragraph 0077, 0046 – 0047 and fig. 4 – 5).

Regarding **claim 2**, Srinivasan et al. also disclose the method as described in claim 1 wherein the entries with single value attributes are stored in the merged table (see fig. 2C, 5 and paragraph 0047).

Regarding **claim 3**, Srinivasan et al. also specify the method as described in claim 1, wherein the entries with multiple value attributes are store in the overflow table (Srinivasan et al. show the telephone number and manager catalog tables in figs. 5, 6C, and 6D, and further disclose in paragraph 0047 of a subschema entry could identify whether an attribute type comprises either single value, or multiple values of that attribute. Example of some entities may have more than one telephone number are also provided).

Regarding **claim 4**, Srinivasan et al. also disclose the method as described in claim 1 wherein the overflow table is an attribute table (figs. 5, 6C, 6D show per attribute tables, which are the overflow tables of the per attribute tables).

Regarding **claim 5**, Srinivasan et al. further show the method as described in claim 1, wherein a majority of the data is stored in the merged table and a set of additional values for the multiple values attributes are stored in the overflow table. The figs. 2C and 5 exemplify merged table in which the majority of the single values are stored. The multiple value attributes of the data from the merged table are seen in figs. 6C and 6D, whose tables are shown with multiple attributes for an instant entry of table 5 (more than one managers and/or telephones per person), illustrate the overflow tables.

Regarding **claim 6**, Srinivasan et al. disclose the method as described in claim 1, wherein the profiling step parses the data to identify entries with single value attributes (paragraph 0047 shows subschema entry can identify whether an attribute type comprises either single value or multiple values. Also, the feature is considered inherent as per the rejected limitations claimed above).

Art Unit: 2127

Regarding **claim 7**, Srinivasan et al. disclose the method as described in claim 1 wherein the profiling step parses the data to identify given operations that are performed on the data once stored (paragraphs 0011 and 0016: "... RDBMS applications are actions and operations to manipulate the data and structures of the database").

Regarding **claim 8**, Srinivasan et al. disclose the method as described in claim 1 wherein the data is stored in a relational database backing store (abstract and paragraph 0019).

### *Conclusion*

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lilian Vo whose telephone number is (703) 305-7864.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.



Lilian Vo  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2127

lv  
May 16, 2003

**JOHN FOLLANSBEE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100**